

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Application

Claims 16-35 are pending in this application. In light of the examiner's comments about the applicant's prior amendments, these claim limitations have been withdrawn from the claims.

Claim Rejections

A The Present Invention

As noted in the previous office action, the present invention, as shown in Figure 30, relates to a system and method for collecting service information and operational information for various types of building systems. The advantage of the present system is that by providing access to operational data and service data, the user can better monitor the performance of their system. A user can use operational data and service data to better determine how well particular systems are working. If user detects an abnormality with the operation of a system, having access to service information can help the user pin-point potential problems with the system. Further, a user can monitor whether service has been conducted properly by having access to operational data to make sure their system has been repaired or maintained properly. A user can request operational data based upon service data provided, and vice versa, to determine how their systems are operating and to perhaps determine the cause of detected problems in a system.

B. Kalantar

The examiner has rejected claims 16-32 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kalantar et al. ("Kalantar). The Kalantar reference generally relates to a work management system for facility management. More specifically, the Kalantar reference relates to a system and method for managing facilities using client devices at each facility that communicate with a central management server through a network.

C. Kalantar does not disclose a method or system whereby operational and service information about a facility or a system can be retrieved such that the two types of information can be used together.

As noted in the previous response, a review of column 32, lines 25-43 shows a management server capable of receiving a task status message. Information about the status of a task, such as a service activity, is not analogous to information about how a system is operating, as the independent claims 16, 22 and 28 require. It is clear from the independent claims that the present invention requires the steps of providing a user either operational or service data, and then receiving a second request from a user to obtain the alternative type of data based upon the first type of data provided. That is, a user, after receiving service information, can request operational data based upon the operational data provided, and vice versa. Despite the examiner's contentions to the contrary, Kalantar fails to disclose this two step process by a user, especially as claimed in claims 16 and 22. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 16, 22 and 28 in light of Kalantar be withdrawn. As dependent claims 17-21, 23-27 and 29-35 incorporate the limitations of the independent claims, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn as well.

Further, with respect to claim 19, Kalantar fails to disclose providing information about the types of systems being serviced. A review of Kalantar shows that it fails to specifically disclose providing information about different

types of systems being serviced. Instead, Kalantar is directed to a facility management operation, where light bulbs are changed, trash is taken out etc.

D. As Kalantar Fails to Disclose All of the Limitations of Independent Claims 16, 22 and 28, the Examiner's Obviousness Rejection of Claims 33-35 Should be Withdrawn

As noted in the previous office action, claims 33-35 have been added to make it clear that the type of systems for which operational and service data is provided are selected from the group consisting of HVAC systems, fire safety systems and mechanical systems. The examiner has rejected claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being unpatentable over Kalantar in view of Hunter et al. ("Hunter"). As Kalantar and/or Hunter fail to disclose the limitations set forth in independent claims 16, 22, and 28, it is respectfully submitted that since claims 16, 22 and 28 are in condition for allowance, dependent claims 33-35 are also in condition for allowance since they incorporate limitations of these independent claims. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of claims 33-35.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicants have made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
SIEMENS CORPORATION

Dated: 5/07/07

By: Michael J. Wallace

Michael J. Wallace
Reg. No. 44,486

SIEMENS CORPORATION
CUSTOMER NO. 28524
Tel. 732-321-3008
Fax. 732-321-3014